



Commissioner of Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
PO Box 1450  
Alexandria VA 22313-1450  
United States of America

By EFS

**In Re Application of:** Keith James Hensel  
**US Application Number:** 10/562,025  
**Filing Date:** 22 December 2005  
**Title:** Juicer  
**Group Art Unit:**  
**Examiner:**  
**Attorney Docket No:** BRE0308U

20 January 2010

Reply to Examiner's Final Rejection

Dear Sirs,

ARGUMENTS

The examiner rejects claim 36 on the basis of Section 112. However claim 36 was cancelled in amendments entered per the Advisory Action mailed September 15, 2009.

The examiner has cited 35USC103 (a) as a basis of rejecting the claims. The examiner has proposed an illogical and proposterous combination of four distinct US patents. In short, the examiner's rejection amounts to no more than hingsight and highly biased reconstruction of the invention. The examiner's proposition can be boiled down to a meaningless conclusion that plastic and metal are interchangeable. In fact, plastic and metal are not interchangeable in any universal sense. The examiner contends that it is known in this art that plastics and metal are alternative or substitute materials for one another. Again, the issue is whether or not in this instance, the invention would have